



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

however, that supernaturalism must necessarily be conceived as wholly true or wholly false ; it may be a very childish, inadequate, and imperfect representation of the relation between man and the universe, and yet may mark an inevitable stage of advance towards a clearer, more consistent, and more rational conception of reality. Perhaps it is but the glass through which the human imagination has caught a glimpse darkly of that truth which a perfected reason would see face to face.

In attempting to notice Mr. Johnson's second objection I am somewhat puzzled, because, while claiming to criticise my method, he simply denies the accuracy of certain statements,—most of which I have never made. Since I expressly avoided discussing the fact of God's existence, I certainly never wrote of His sitting apart in a kind of deistic remoteness. My subject was simply the influence upon morality of the *belief* in the supernatural. Such a belief has existed and does exist ; surely it is legitimate to ask what is its relation to the moral life, without bringing in all the categories of metaphysical speculation. My critic does, I must humbly confess, take me out of my philosophical depth when he pronounces the question of existence to be psychological, while those of meaning and validity are metaphysical. Perhaps, if I could understand this, I might also know wherein my answer to Dr. Wilde is an *ignoratio elenchi*.

E. RITCHIE.

WELLESLEY COLLEGE.

A NOTE.

THE last number of the INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ETHICS contained a review of my pamphlet “*Études historiques sur l'Esthétique de Saint Thomas d'Aquin*,” by Mr. Davidson. Noticing some confusion in the criticism there offered, I desire to suggest a few corrections.

My purpose having been historical,—that is, to determine St. Thomas's doctrine,—Mr. Davidson's scornful opinion of the great philosopher should not be taken as though it were my own theory that was in question. The Belgian press has, to some extent, made that mistake, hence I wish to call attention to it.

Two of my conclusions as to St. Thomas and the ancients are impeached by Mr. Davidson. (1) I state : “Greek and mediæval writers before St. Thomas confined themselves almost exclusively to the *ontological* element in the beautiful ; St. Thomas treats both

the *ontological* and the *psychological* elements.” This is a *fact* in regard to which Mr. Davidson and I take directly opposite views. (2) I assert “that the ancients identified the beautiful and the good, because they saw in those two notions specially an objective, ontological element. St. Thomas clearly distinguished the two, showing that the beautiful and the good differ by a subjective or psychological element.”

This the reviewer denies, citing Aristotle to sustain his denial. ($\tauῆς μὲν γὰρ ποιήσεως ἔτερον τὸ τέλος, τῆς δὲ πράξεως οὐδὲ ἀνεῖ: ἔστι γὰρ αὐτῇ ἡ εὐπραξία τέλος.$ *Eth. Nicom.*, VI., 5.) To this, I observe, first, that my position is the position held by many able writers. For instance, MM. Fouillée, of your editorial committee (“*La Philosophie de Platon*”), and Bénard (“*L’Esthétique d’Aristote et de ses Successeurs*”) hold that the ancients *generally* identify the *good* and the *beautiful* (not only the *moral* good, as Mr. Davidson says),—that the Socratical *χαλοναγαθία* is commonly applied to the beautiful and the *moral* good.

Secondly, the test of Aristotle has no bearing on the point in question. He often uses the word *ποιεῖν* (in opposition to *πράττειν*), and he understands by it *any (every) exterior action*, not artistic activity *exclusively*, *πράττειν* denoting merely an internal, psychical activity.

Finally, the reviewer misrepresents my meaning in some minor points. He says I hint that the works of the Areopagite may be by the disciple of St. Paul. When I refer the first time to these writings, I speak of them as *attributed* to St. Denys (p. 8 of my pamphlet). I speak of the controversy about their authenticity on page 28, but I *expressly abstain* from accepting either conclusion. I say there: “*Quoiqu'il en soit* (de l’authenticité ou de la non-authenticité), ceux qui revendiquent pour St. Denys la propriété de ces ouvrages, comme ceux qui la lui contestent, sont d'accord pour affirmer la ressemblance indéniable entre la doctrine qu'ils contiennent et les théories des néo-platoniciens.” My aim did not require me to take a position, since it is not the *author* but the *doctrine* which comes into question in regard to St. Thomas. The point to establish is this: These writings contain no æsthetical doctrine which is not found in neo-platonic works; and I cite, as agreeing on this point, both those who agree and those who do not agree on the question of authorship.

The reviewer takes a position on the question of the doctrine, by denying that the works banish the pantheistic (neo-platonic) filiation of being. The question as to the pantheism of the pseudo-

Dionysius is an open one. A similar controversy exists in regard to Ruysbroeck and other mystic authors.

M. DE WULF.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUVAIN, BELGIUM.

THE LATE PROFESSOR WALLACE.

PROFESSOR WALLACE's death is too recent, and the sense of personal loss still too keen amongst those who knew him best, to allow yet of any adequate estimate of his work as thinker and teacher. But it is right, perhaps, that the various philosophical journals should publish articles which, though in a certain sense inadequate, serve to illustrate different aspects of his influence and to remind us how many-sided in his greatness he was. The perfect simplicity and honesty of his character, together with his rare power of sympathetic insight, enabled him to enter into the meaning, and to grasp the underlying truth, of much which to lesser men appears merely self-contradictory. This catholicity was a characteristic note of his teaching; for he was incapable of pretence, or show, or special pleading, and his whole work was a faithful manifestation of the man himself.

It is with more special reference to his influence in Oxford that these few words are written. The writer is old enough to have "heard Green," but young enough to have come for two years (as an undergraduate) under the influence of Wallace's teaching. Perhaps nothing can bring out better the relation between him and his predecessor, and the task he felt lay before him to fulfil, than the concluding words of his inaugural lecture in December, 1882:

"It is well occasionally to look back with grateful affection to the great traditions of our past. It is even more needful to prepare ourselves to take a worthy part in moulding the age to come: solicitous that by the full measure of our abilities, unbiassed by merely scholastic interests, the Oxford of the new generation may be, not perhaps more learned or more dignified, but wiser in discerning the main line of public good, readier to co-operate in the movement towards making life beautiful, true, and honest, and more generously zealous to become to England, without distinction of rank or sect, a high court of intellectual and moral justice."

It is as a judge in this high court that Wallace will be best known as time goes on. While it is as impossible, as it is inappropriate, to